



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/485,245	03/27/2000	ALISON HOPKINS	28911/36128	1697

7590 05 31/2002

MARSHALL O'TOOLE GERSTEIN
MURRAY & BORUN
6300 SEARS TOWER
233 SOUTH WACKER DRIVE
CHICAGO, IL 60606-6402

[REDACTED] EXAMINER

WILDER, CYNTHIA B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1637	19

DATE MAILED: 05/31/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Interview Summary	Application No. 09/485,245	Applicant(s) Hopkins, A
	Examiner CB Wilder	Art Unit 1655
		

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) CB Wilder

(3) _____

(2) Jeffrey Sharpe

(4) _____

Date of Interview May 14, 2002

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
 c) Personal [copy is given to 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No. If yes, brief description:

Claim(s) discussed: 1 and 2

Identification of prior art discussed:

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Mr. Sharpe discussed the claimed invention with the examiner and claimed differences over the cited prior art. The Examiner discussed with Mr. Sharpe that the compositions disclosed in the Example is convincing that the claimed composition is operable. However, all of reagents of the composition are not fully disclosed such as e.g. dilution buffer. The examiner also reminded Mr. Sharpe that any material added to the specification may constitute new matter. Mr. Sharpe told the examiner that the buffer could be explained and suggested filing a declaration.

Although the case is a first action final, the Examiner agreed to consider the declaration upon filing.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached

Cynthia Wilder

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required